

**APPENDIX C**  
**Public Comments**

**This page intentionally left blank.**

## **PART 1 - COMMENTS ON GENERAL PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING**

60 responses were received after the initial work force restructuring announcement, which contained over 100 comments, concerns, and suggestions. The input was categorized into five major topic areas:

- General
- Work force restructuring
- Reinventing government
- Outsourcing
- Community impact

The comments in the categories of reinventing government and outsourcing were not addressed in this plan, and were forwarded to the cognizant RL organization for disposition.

If at all feasible, the comments in the categories of general, work force restructuring, and community impact were incorporated into the Plan. Some suggestions were not applicable, and for others incorporation was not practical. For those comments not addressed in the Plan, below is a synopsis of the comment or suggestion, and a response addressing the rationale for why it was not incorporated.

### **General**

**Comment 1:** Freeze the annual budget at FY94 levels, and have the restructuring plan mandate a twenty-five percent downsizing of the Site work force over two years. Budgetary savings would be allocated to outsourcing, subcontracting, and merit increases.

**Response:** The arbitrary choices of the FY94 budget level, and a twenty-five percent downsizing do not take into account the work force and resource planning necessary to assure that the number of workers with the right skills are maintained on the Site. Adequate resources must be available to assure the accomplishment of the environmental management mission.

**Comment 2:** The plan should apply to all employees on site regardless of employer, including federal employees, M&O contractors and subcontractors.

**Response:** Any employee of a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Energy employed at RL will be eligible under this Plan. At RL, the extent of benefits, such as the separation incentive programs, have limited eligibility. Other programs, such as preferential hiring, depend upon separation status, e.g. involuntary reduction of force. Otherwise, all employees who meet the eligibility criteria may receive the benefits outlined in this Plan.

**Comment 3:** Congressional and State representatives should be advised of the plan and the adverse impacts.

**Response:** As key stakeholders, the input of state and national representatives was solicited through the 120 day notification which occurred on February 14/15. Communication with the stakeholders is a continuing process. The state and national representatives, as well as all other identified stakeholders, will be continually advised of work force restructuring actions as they develop.

**Comment 4:** A disconnect exists between the apparent intent of the law, the down-sizing of the nuclear defense complex, and the content of the 120 day notice from the Manager, which focused on all restructuring initiatives.

**Response:** Although Section 3161 only applies to work force restructuring as a result of the reconfiguration of the defense complex, the Secretary of Energy has determined that the principles reflected in Section 3161 should be applied to all work force restructuring actions throughout the DOE complex.

#### **Work Force Restructuring - General**

**Comment 5:** The plan should be structured to acknowledge the need for a more field oriented work force to support the Environmental Restoration program.

**Response:** Skills mix will be addressed in the contractors' work force planning process. The DOE itself has begun a transition to field oriented staff with the location of federal employees to the various areas on the Hanford Site and the implementation of a Site Representatives program. These programs promote "hands-on" oversight and teaming with the contractors.

**Comment 6:** Stakeholder committees should be established to address reemployment issues.

**Response:** Stakeholders have several opportunities to provide input to the formulation of the Plan. With the initial 120 day notice, input was solicited which was considered in the development of the draft Plan. The draft Plan is also available for stakeholder review and comments. The comments received during this second review period have been considered in the development of this document.

**Comment 7:** Plan coverage should be extended to construction workers.

**Response:** Recognizing that some construction workers are long service employees and contributed to the end of the Cold War, limited Plan coverage has been extended to them.

### **Work Force Restructuring - Reduction of Force**

**Comment 8:** A 120 day notice of employment reductions is inadequate to effectively prepare for job losses.

**Response:** The DOE strives to give as much advance notice of impending work force restructuring as possible. The purpose of the 120 day notice is to notify all employees and the community at large that work force changes are necessary. However, the notice does not necessarily mean that job losses will occur at the expiration of the notice. Specific lay off notification to individuals will be made only after careful consideration is given to all possible mitigating actions. If specific job losses are to occur, employees will be given a 60 day advance notice as required by the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act.

### **Work Force Restructuring - Outplacement Assistance**

**Comment 9:** Local unions should contact Internationals for job availabilities.

**Response:** If restructuring actions do result in separations, as a part of the Outplacement Assistance program, unions will be encouraged to contact their International Headquarters regarding job identification, postings, arranging interviews, and participating in job fairs. However, RL cannot require that local unions contact their International office for job placement assistance.

### **Work Force Restructuring - Preferential Hiring Treatment**

**Comment 10:** Placement assistance and preferential hiring should be arranged with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Umatilla Army Depot.

**Response:** If restructuring actions do result in separations, as a part of the Outplacement Assistance program, other local and regional federal agencies will be encouraged to cooperate with job identification, postings, arranging interviews, and participating in job fairs.

### **General Questions**

**Question 1:** Will total employment actually be reduced by 500 to 1,000 or will increases in other areas generate either no net change or even increases in total Hanford employment?

**Response:** It is estimated that total Hanford employment will be reduced by 2,500 positions as a result of work force restructuring actions. It is the DOE's primary concern to prevent or mitigate adverse effects to workers through managing employment levels and training programs to accommodate all impacted workers. It is not expected that the creation of other jobs will offset the number of affected positions.

**Question 2:** Will performance or length of service be considered in determining layoffs?

**Response:** Separation programs will be handled in accordance with the individual company's policies and procedures, and applicable collective bargaining agreement in the case of represented employees.

## COMMENTS ON JULY 27, 1994 DRAFT PLAN

As outlined in the section on Stakeholder Involvement, the 3161 Steering Committee comprised of community, Indian Nation, union, and employee representatives worked with RL staff to facilitate public involvement and cooperate in the review of all public comments received on the draft plan released on July 28, 1994. The result of this cooperation was a community redraft of the plan, which was written to be representative of public input received, and was submitted to RL on November 1, 1994. In review of the public input, all comments were either incorporated into the plan, or the Steering Committee provided their response to the comments they did not incorporate. These responses are summarized in Part 2 of this Appendix.

In its development of the final draft plan, RL closely considered the community redraft of the plan. Changes made by RL to the recommendations of the Steering Committee contained in their redraft, and responses to public comments not addressed by the community representatives are outlined in Part 3 of this Appendix.

### Part 2 - Steering Committee Summary

#### The Hanford Site Work Force Restructuring Plan

##### INTRODUCTION

Comments received: 6

These comments dealt with the overall structure, content and tone of the first draft plan, i.e. "it was confusing," "things were too broadly defined," etc. These comments were addressed in the second draft plan with efforts to make it easier to understand. Reference boxes, definitions of acronyms, and graphics were added to aid readers.

##### OBJECTIVE

Comments received: 3

These comments questioned the efficiency of DOE and its contractors to achieve the objectives of the plan. Congress requires the plan to be updated no later than one year after its initial release. Over 14 specific areas were added to the second draft as topics to be reviewed for the update. An assessment will also be made regarding the degree to which the Plan objectives have been achieved.

##### STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Comments received: 19

Over 80 key stakeholders were involved in writing the second draft and addressing over 700 public comments on the draft plan. Comments that the plan is not equitable to all stakeholders or to smaller communities have been addressed within the plan.

## **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

Comments received: 32

Most of the comments on Eligibility asked for clarification on why: 1) certain dates were chosen and 2) only certain contractors were listed. The second draft plan clears up these questions by providing more information on the business/government decisions driving these choices. Other Eligibility comments protested the criteria as too restrictive. The Stakeholder Steering Committee feels that the Eligibility Criteria are fair.

## **PREFERENCE IN HIRING, NOTIFICATION AND MEASURING RESULTS**

Comments received: 18

A substantial change was made by the Stakeholder Steering Committee on Preference in Hiring by extending preference to Voluntarily Separated Workers who complete the Training and Education program.

### **Retaining the Work Force**

#### **WORK FORCE PLANNING/ INTERNAL TRANSITION OF EXISTING STAFF**

The Work Force Planning Committee received 30 public/employee comments

The key issues of concern were:

- Clarification on the "Hanford Integrated Work Force Planning Process" model.
- Work Force Impacts and identifying specific occupational job classifications that will be affected.
- Creating a unified system for Work Force Planning 5 - 10 years out.
- Making all of the above information available to the public.

The majority of these comments were incorporated into the plan with the exception of: "Avoid having principal contractors project the work force by using an outside contractor."

Reason: It is the job of the current contractors to maintain adequate human resources to fulfill the terms of their contract; projecting the work force is required of them as part of their normal business.

### **Programs for Separated Workers**

This portion of the plan received the majority of public comments.



## **EARLY ENHANCED RETIREMENT**

Comments received: 363.

The enhanced retirement portion of the plan received a disproportionate number of comments. Each comment was reviewed by the Stakeholder Sub-committee for Separations and representatives from RL.

Most of the comments regarding early retirement were questions regarding the individual's eligibility for receiving the early enhanced retirement option and how it might affect their personal situation. The committee could not answer these individual questions efficiently. However, the committee took the underlying message in these comments into consideration when drafting their section. A recommendation was made for employees to consult with their Human Resources Office regarding how the plan will affect them personally, see page 28.

One hundred eleven comments were received asking that the "3 years for age/3 years for service" incentive be changed to an "optional 6." These suggestions were taken into account and incorporated into the plan. Although the early retirement incentive was changed by RL, the committee recommended that: 1) the "optional 6" be given, 2) the bridge payment remain at \$250, and 3) the ban on reemployment remain at one year. (The final decision was to lower the bridge payment to \$125. See page 29.)

## **BAN ON REEMPLOYMENT**

Comments received 36

No changes were made to the draft plan as a result of the comments on this topic. Language in the draft plan was expanded, however, to more fully explain the purpose of the ban. Responses to comments are as follows:

Comments recommending complete removal of the ban:

The cost savings objective of enhanced early retirement will not be fully realized if many of the participants return to Hanford jobs within one year, even on a part-time basis. In specific instances where critical skills and knowledge are involved, RL may approve exceptions to the ban.

Comment recommending shorter ban period:

A reemployment ban of one full year will be needed to help achieve the cost savings that justify the enhanced retirement incentives.

Comment recommending that the plan should clarify that retired employees may be hired by commercial companies:

The plan generally does not affect the rights of retired employees to work elsewhere. Some restrictions may apply, however, if the employment involves working at essentially the same job through a sub-contractor.

Comment recommending the rehiring of up to 10% of participants in enhanced retirement:

RL may approve the rehiring of retired employees when clear needs exist, although the extent of those needs is unpredictable. Leaving the percentage of allowable exceptions to the ban makes the plan more feasible.

#### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SITE PLANS

Comments received: 80

Several items were incorporated into the second draft which addresses these comments. First, RL engaged Wyatt Actuaries to study if the Hanford Site Plan was comparable to plans at other sites, specifically Oak Ridge and Savannah River. They concluded that it is comparable to, if not better than, the plans at other sites. The study and the site plans for all other DOE sites are available for review at the DOE Public Reading Room.

#### OTHER

All other comments were incorporated into or addressed within the second draft Plan.

#### Special Programs

#### PREFERENCE IN HIRING

See above

#### TRAINING AND EDUCATION/ OUTPLACEMENT ASSISTANCE

Comments and Responses:

Provide outplacement assistance to early retirees. It will provide a retirement incentive. It will help businesses in the Tri-Cities locate qualified people and be an incentive for new companies to locate here. Younger retirees have energy, knowledge and skills to offer. Excluding early retirees is a form of age discrimination.

The plan's existing incentives for early retirement are considered adequate, and in fact, are clearly more generous than the VROF and IROF packages.

The executive summary and the plan only speaks to the number of employees affected in calendar year 1994, what about out years? It seems there will be more employees affected in 1995 and later, but there is no identification of what is planned by DOE on this subject.

This comment isn't peculiar to Outplacement Assistance and should be addressed elsewhere. However, the section on Measuring Results and Updating the Plan (page 60) does indicate that the results of this restructuring plan will be evaluated and that the plan will be updated on a yearly basis to reflect any relevant changes in circumstances.

It seems that the market survey which is planned as a training and education service can also serve as an outplacement service.

It can be expected that survey data will be shared between the assistance programs.

The plan provides little detail on how the various services that are contemplated will be implemented.

This has been addressed in the text of the plan.

Costs of the various services are not identified.

Cost of each outplacement assistance service depends on the extent of its use, which in some cases could be none at all, while in other cases could be very extensive.

How will the effectiveness of each service be evaluated?

Initiation of services (the order and extent) will be based on previous experience in managing work force reductions. Effectiveness will be evidenced by the extent to which the various services are helpful to users' efforts to secure other employment.

The final draft of the plan should compare...outplacement programs for Hanford with those implemented at other DOE locations.

Site-by-site comparisons have been made of this and other elements of the sites' plans. However, specific similarities or differences are not necessarily meaningful, as conditions which influence the need for, and practicality of, outplacement assistance are not equal. Differences exist with regard to such factors as numbers of impacted employees, skills involved, local and regional economic circumstances, local and regional job market conditions, etc.

As a generality, Hanford's outplacement assistance services are consistent with DOE guidelines, and each is equivalent to the most liberal of those at other DOE sites, with one exception: Hanford's relocation allowance has a \$3000 limit, while some sites provide up to \$5000.

Where will workstations be located and during what hours will they be available? Where and how often will outplacement workshops be offered, and how can a person register to attend?

Locations, operating schedules, registration procedures, and other pertinent details of these and other outplacement services will be publicized in the news media and posted in offices of job placement service agencies identified in the Outplacement Assistance section of the Plan.

Clarify the difference between relocation package and relocation assistance. [These terms appear at the end of the Outplacement Assistance section of the plan.] Which organization is responsible for these costs -- the sending organization or receiving organization?

Relocation package refers to the established practice of a DOE operation or contractor to mitigate the moving expenses incurred by certain employees who are hired or transferred into its organization. Thus, it is provided by the receiving organization. Provisions of the package may vary from one organization to another.

Relocation assistance is other help provided by this Plan (moving expenses up to \$3000) for persons who are not eligible for a relocation package. As stated in the plan, the allowable amount will be given by the Hanford Site employer -- the sending organization.

Relocation allowance should include moving expenses for a move to any job, not just to another DOE site, contractor or subcontractor.

The plan as constituted already represents a liberal application of this provision by including DOE contractor and subcontractor locations other than DOE sites, which are not mentioned in the enabling federal law (Section 3161). The law says other Department of Energy facilities and DOE Headquarters guidelines say another Department site.

Extend the eligibility limit for outplacement assistance from one year to two years, to accommodate those who complete school using the tuition plan (2 years after layoff) and provide more time to find a new job.

The plan now states (page 41) that outplacement services will be available to separated workers for a period of one year following termination or until they are gainfully reemployed, whichever comes first. It is felt that this is a reasonable commitment of resources for job-search assistance. Students who continue their studies into a second year (or beyond) can be expected to utilize either the student placement office that is available at most educational institutions, or local government or private employment services.

Clarify whether outplacement assistance will be available to others besides RL and its contractors, such as intermittent workers as mentioned under TERMINATION PAYMENT FOR INTERMITTENT WORKERS.

This has been clarified in the text of the plan.

Will outplacement assistance be provided only to those who have received a layoff notice after having exhausted all internal placement opportunities? The benefits should be limited to employees in layoff status, not just for fishing.

Outplacement assistance is not intended to provide job-fishing services to employees whose positions are not impacted by work force reductions.

The outplacement services will be available to those eligible employees (as defined on page 41) who are notified in writing by their employer that their job is, or is expected to be, surplus. Normally such notice is not given if internal placement opportunities still remain. Employees who have received such notice need not wait until they have been separated before using available services.

The services will also be available to employees who exercise the voluntary reduction of force option.

Why is procurement of outplacement assistance services from an external source limited to an as-needed basis?

The term was intended to indicate that such services will be procured if they are needed, but not if they aren't. Since that intent is made clear in other words elsewhere, the term has been deleted.

Are all DOE complex jobs available through the JOBBS system?

The plan text now states that the system matches affected employees' resumes with job opportunities across the DOE complex.

When Hanford work is outsourced, the employer who assumes the work should be required to give hiring preference to affected Hanford employees.

This has been discussed in the Community Impact and Economic Development section of the plan.

### Community Impact and Economic Development

The Community Impact and Economic Development Committee received 88 public/employee comments

The key issues, concerns, and recommendations were broken down into eight sub-categories which have been addressed in the current Plan (see Part VI and Appendix G). Several specific recommendations were not included in the Plan. They are described below in "Comments Not Included" with reasons for excluding these recommendations.

A brief sampling of the comments or discussion about the comments that were incorporated in the Plan are noted in these eight sub-categories:

- General Comments (including Goals, Drivers, Summary of Near Term Actions, Planning and Policy Activities)
- Private Sector Partnerships (Leveraged Outsourcing/Privatization)
- Economic Conversion of Assets
- Infrastructure Transition
- Worker Training/Retraining (Impacting Community/Economic Development)
- Technology Transfer and Commercialization
- Issues, Barriers and Resolutions
- Special Projects (including New Federal Missions)

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

##### Sampling of Comments

These comments expressed support for including a community impacts section in the Plan; wanted the plan to be more specific than the July 1994 draft had been; pointed out the benefits to the Communities and to economic development from having an early retirement and voluntary separation plan that permitted many of the displaced workers to remain in their respective Communities; wanted the plan equitable to other sites; wanted to limit stakeholders to "true stakeholders" negatively impacted by Hanford's restructuring; pointed out need to keep smaller communities and/or communities not in Benton/Franklin counties regularly involved in the planning, communication, funding and interaction stages of the 3161 process; expressed concern that the job of replacing the Hanford jobs was difficult and that relying solely on environmental cleanup industries to be started or recruited to the Communities was ill advised. Many other comments were reviewed and incorporated into the Plan.

#### PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS (including Leveraged Outsourcing/Privatization)

##### Commentary

Emphasis on this economic transition tool varied substantially in the comments. Some comments were critical of using leveraged outsourcing to create jobs, stating that it would transfer existing high paying internal jobs to lower pay external jobs. Others lauded this approach as being the highest priority providing displaced workers with local/regional jobs and providing the Communities with diversified industries less dependent on government and/or Hanford. Still others noted the national "competitiveness" mandate or the need to emphasize "dual" federal/private use. At least one commentator suggested the need to reduce or eliminate the disparate views about leveraged outsourcing using negotiations between labor, management and the Communities. A common thread among comments received in this section (and other areas) was the need to involve stakeholders early in the process. The committee felt these different views appear to be resolvable. Driving the need to resolve these differences is the fact that business as usual is likely to create the largest adverse impact on the largest number of stakeholders.

## ECONOMIC CONVERSION OF ASSETS

### Commentary

The more common view of this economic transition tool was related to conversion of Hanford assets under the Atomic Energy Communities Act. (A local example is the recently converted Hanford Metal Working Equipment.) Used in the broader context of any Hanford-related asset, e.g., land, personnel, intellectual property, future contracting and procurement actions, etc., then a number of commentators offered recommendations about this sub-category. Excluding the potential misapplication of outsourcing or privatization without the appropriate "leverage," there was strong support for continuation and expansion of asset conversion.

## INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSITION

### Sampling of Comments

Other than several comments dealing with physical improvements and basic Site services (covered in detail in Appendix G), comments in this category were generally related to other sections in Part VI or to other parts of the Plan. Comments included a heavy emphasis on entrepreneurial training, start-up business training, training or coaching about how to utilize the leverage outsourcing and other transition tools; conversion of Hanford assets, e.g., fabrication capabilities staffed with displaced Hanford workers and available Community work force adversely affected by the transition; and investment of a portion of future Hanford productivity savings in Community infrastructure such as destination retirement amenities. Investments in infrastructure, including brick and mortar investments if necessary, were judged to be important for mitigating adverse impacts of transition.

## WORKER RETRAINING (related to Community Impact and Economic Development)

### Commentary

Comments emphasized using all training opportunities available to the Communities to mitigate the adverse impacts of restructuring. While the Plan calls attention to a few examples of training that could lead to a new Community industry with national and international markets, no training avenues are intended to be excluded. New initiatives like the Columbia Basin College training center, on-going programs like PETE (Partnership for Environmental Technology Education) Northwest, and existing training forums and councils need to be linked and collaborative to provide the greatest potential for benefits to workers, the Communities and Hanford.

## TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

### Commentary

Technology transfer can be or is involved in virtually all of the economic transition actions taken to mitigate adverse economic impacts from restructuring. Comments covered almost all aspects of this broader definition of technology transfer including actions taken to improve technology transfers out of Hanford and into Hanford; actions to help the inventor or originator of technology have a greater chance of success; mentoring using either entrepreneurial leaves of absence or the already approved staff exchanges; steps to improve private investment in Hanford technologies when started up within the Communities or using displaced Hanford workers; added emphasis on partnerships that lead to greater or accelerated transfers of technology or emphasize greater participation by the private sector; and others.

## ISSUES, BARRIERS AND RESOLUTIONS

### Sampling of Comments

This section had one of the highest number of specific comments, totaling about 20. Typical examples of the comments were: rapidly identify and resolve barriers to economic diversification initiatives; facilitate Hanford contracting and purchasing with local companies and with companies who locate in the Communities; provide incentives like sole or preferential sourcing to Hanford spin-out companies or Hanford technology based companies located in the Community; streamline leasing and transfers; use and enforce standards for private partnerships and infrastructure; permit employee equity in spin-outs and outsourced companies; plan, especially relative to comprehensive land uses and put more focus on long term planning in general; broaden definitions of stakeholders beyond Benton/Franklin Counties, i.e., all impacted by restructuring regardless of jurisdiction and wherever located; and others.

## USER FACILITY SPECIAL PROJECTS

### Commentary

This section was added based on commentators who wanted to ensure that DOE and the region not give up on the possibility of new missions, especially federal-based missions that would benefit from using the Hanford site assets. Examples included the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory (LIGO) and the Superconducting Magnetic Energy Storage (SMES) demonstration unit. Some sites are aggressively seeking new missions and the Communities and RL should do the same. Related to new missions were comments recommending that Battelle and the Pacific Northwest Laboratory mission be maintained and expanded.

## COMMENTS NOT INCLUDED

### Commentary and Sampling of Comments

Two types of comments related to Community Impact and Economic Development were not included in the Plan:

1. Several commentators requested that specific communities, geographic regions and other entities be mentioned in the Plan. For example, Sunnyside, lower Yakima Valley and Yakima were requested to be specifically named in the Plan. Moreover, some stated that it appeared to be heavily biased towards those in Benton and Franklin Counties or towards TRIDEC. In contrast, others stated that they wanted the plan to exclude all but selected regions such as Benton and Franklin Counties and to not emphasize or include some entities. Neither of these opposite views were incorporated in the Plan. In drafting the Community Impact and Economic Development part of the Plan, no individuals or entities are excluded provided they are negatively impacted by the Hanford Work Force Restructuring activities. The definitions and text in the Plan make this point clear. It was assumed in drafting the Plan that there would be some rational basis for allocating resources associated with the Plan in approximate proportion to the magnitude of the adverse impacts to the various communities, geographic regions and other entities.



2. Several commentators suggested that leveraged outsourcing, use of subcontractors or other third parties, or any actions taken to disturb the status quo could be detrimental to the existing work force at Hanford. Others, including the Hanford Economic Transition Initiative (RL/Contractors initiative) and the Sustainable Economic Transition Initiative (TRIDEC initiative), generally take a different or significantly modified point of view. This Plan reflects the latter view. If the actions taken are to increase, not decrease, the opportunities for longer term employment (especially for the work force displaced by Hanford restructuring and downsizing) and greater economic stability in the area, then this Plan generally supports those actions. In addition, such actions that decrease Hanford's costs become triply important -- to the Communities, the displaced workers, and Hanford. Actions taken solely to reduce Hanford's costs, i.e., become more cost effective, are not addressed in this Community Impact and Economic Development part of the Plan. Cost reduction actions are the basis for the balance of the Plan that deal with reducing the work force at Hanford through early retirement, voluntary separations and involuntary reductions in force. Except for the section on Special Projects (including New Federal Missions), the measures outlined in the Community Impact and Economic Development part of the Plan focus primarily on replacement businesses and industries, spin-outs, and new start-ups that should be capable of providing high value or family wage jobs. If this Plan is successful most of these replacement jobs will occur throughout the Communities in diversified industries owned and operated by the private sector.

#### Measuring Results and Updating the Plan

See Above

This page intentionally left blank.

## COMMENTS ON JULY 27, 1994 DRAFT PLAN

### Part 3 - DOE Summary

#### Format changes to Community Draft:

1. The full page Executive Summary from the July 27 draft was edited and reinserted to the Steering Committee's draft to provide a comprehensive overview to the Plan.
2. A Table of Contents was added.
3. Abbreviations was moved to Appendix A.
4. Volume 2, Part I (comment summary and response) was incorporated into the Plan as Appendix C.
5. Appendices from the original draft were reincorporated, including Employee and Community Notification (Appendix D), and List of Stakeholders (Appendix B)
6. The Benefits Matrix on page 28 was corrected and incorporated as Appendix F.
7. Volume 2, Part V outlining the communities' recommendations to HETI was moved to Appendix G.
8. HQ guidance on updating work force restructuring plans was incorporated as Appendix H.
9. Additional boxes were added with additional reference items.
10. Volume 2, Parts II, III, and IV were removed from the Plan. These binders contain background information such as transcripts from the public workshops, copies of all written comments, and the HQ guidelines and are available through the DOE Public Reading Room.

The text of the draft was edited for technical accuracy, grammar, and flow of ideas. Changes in concepts or policies are outlined below.

#### Part I - Stakeholder Involvement

##### STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

- The first round of public comment on the General Planning Guidelines for Work Force Restructuring was omitted from the Steering Committee's draft and was reinserted from the July 27 draft.
- Distribution of the draft Plan to the local communities and on Site was omitted from the Steering Committee's draft and was reinserted from the July 27 draft.

## Part II - Background

### INTRODUCTION

- DOE's transition from defense production to clean up has been a gradual change and this was revised from the Steering Committee's draft.
- The Steering Committee's draft was corrected to reflect that the Plan is submitted to DOE-HQ for approval and to Congress for review and comment.
- The Tri-Party Agreement was referenced but not explained in the July 27 draft and the Steering Committee's draft. A brief explanation was added.

### ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

- Definition of eligible intermittent employees was corrected from that in the Steering Committee's draft.
- The Steering Committee defined "lower tier" contractors as extending only to the first level. This was corrected.

## Part III - Retaining the Work Force

### WORK FORCE PLANNING

- Corrections from the Steering Committee's draft were made to the outputs and capabilities of the model.

## Part IV - Programs for Separated Workers

### MEDICAL BENEFITS

- Eligible employees was corrected to reflect only M&O employees.

### FUNDING

- This section was revised to include more information, and moved to the section on Funding and Measurement.

### SEPARATION INCENTIVES - Enhanced Retirement

- Corrected to reflect program approved by HQ on October 18. In accordance with business objectives and cost considerations, the original program was revised to a 3+3 flexible plan.
- To counter increased costs of the flexible 3+3, the bridge payment was lowered from \$250 to \$125 per month.

- The Limited Reemployment provision was increased from 1 year to 3 years to further RL's goal of reducing site employment numbers.
- Eligibility Matrix is a summary of information in the Plan, and as such was moved to Appendix F.
- The issue of linking service from all site or all DOE contractors for the purposes of retirement eligibility and pension computation was not addressed by the community teams. It is separate from that of work force restructuring and will not be addressed in the Plan.
- Suggestions for additional or enhanced medical benefits, life insurance coverage, and pension computations were not considered. Retiree benefits programs are administered in accordance with the negotiated M&O contracts/advance understandings.

#### Part V - Special Programs

##### PREFERENCE IN HIRING

- The Steering Committee added a preference to voluntarily separated employees who utilize the Training and Education Assistance program, after Federally mandated preferences, such as Veteran's, and after involuntarily separated employees. RL concurs.

##### TRAINING AND EDUCATION

- Reference to DOE support to entrepreneurial development and technology commercialization was not relevant to this section and was referred to the Community Impact Assistance section.
- Apprenticeship program was modeled after provisions in the Rocky Flats and the Idaho PTI work force restructuring plans. RL concurs.
- The environmental restoration scholarship assistance and the Teacher's assistance were added. These are standard programs which individual sites are responsible for implementing, and for which Department of Defense contacts have been arranged by HQ. RL concurs.
- The Steering Committee specified that employees given notice of lay off were allowed to retrain on work time. RL concurs.
- The Steering Committee expanded the term of the educational assistance from two years to three years to add flexibility with no increase in total monetary benefit. RL concurs.
- The Steering Committee expanded the use of the educational assistance to include child care while attending class. RL concurs.

##### OUTPLACEMENT ASSISTANCE

- The Steering Committee stipulated that outplacement assistance would be available for a period of one year following termination or until they are gainfully reemployed, whichever comes first. RL concurs.

- Additional information regarding the operation of the JOBBS system was reinserted from the July 27 draft for clarity.
- The statements under Resume Distribution regarding worker eligibility and participation is applicable to the entire section and was moved to the section introduction.
- The Interstate Job Bank was added by HQ. This is a standard program which individual sites are responsible for implementing, and for which a Department of Labor contact has been arranged by HQ.
- The Relocation Stipend was changed by the Steering Committee from \$2,000 to \$3,000, which is within the HQ guidance ranges. RL concurs.
- Relocation Expenses box was eliminated. This appeared to serve as background to the community representative's increase of the relocation stipend to \$3,000, and may have been better placed in the appendix on responses to community input.

#### **Part VI - Community Impact and Economic Development**

The Community Impact Assistance section in the July 27 draft plan was a summary of the Hanford Economic Transition Initiative (HETI). Through the public involvement process, RL cooperated with community representatives to create a document outlining goals and success indicators of an economic development plan. This plan was reflected in the November 1 draft. Simultaneously, the HETI Program Plan was developed and submitted to RL for review. This document reflects the business lines RL will follow in pursuing economic development and diversification for the region while partnering with the community for a sustainable local economy. The HETI Program Plan will be the guidelines RL will follow to implement economic development.

The draft submitted by the community steering group on November 1 was edited to more clearly delineate responsibilities for economic initiatives between community entities and RL. Appendix G reflects the communities' recommendations and interpretations of the HETI business lines. Goals and success indicators are reflected in this section and RL will work with the communities to accommodate, where practicable their desires, and economic demands. DOE will support the communities' plan to the extent such plans are consistent with DOE needs and resource limitations.

#### **Part VII - Measuring Results and Updating the Plan**

- Funding and Costs were moved to this section, and information from the July 27 draft was reincorporated and updated.
- This plan will be updated in accordance with Section 3161 and applicable DOE guidance.